REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant's hereby confirm the oral election made by the undersigned on November 8, 2005 to restrict the present application to claims 12-21, without traverse and have now indicated that claims 1-11 stand withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects claims 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelly et al. The Examiner states that as per claimed, Kelly discloses an arbitration circuit for an output port which comprises a FIFO queue in FIGURE 8, elements 831 containing a head pointer at a plurality of characterizing data for each packet received at the input port, the queue forming a look-up table to determine which data will be sent out from the output port and the plurality of arbitration circuits coupled to the look-up table for selecting the next packet to sent out corresponding to a preselected characterizing datum. The Examiner states that, with respect to Claim 13, Kelly discloses that the head pointer of the selected packet is utilized to select the packet from a memory and as to Claim 14 the Examiner states that Kelly discloses memory is a common memory for a plurality of arbitration circuits and specifically refers to Col. 9, LL 35-48 wherein the buffer sets implies common memory.

We can not agree. Col. 9, LL 49-64 of Kelly recites "...only one output buffer set (per port per virtual channel)..." (Emphasis added). Accordingly, it is clear that this system falls squarely within the prior art described in the background in the present invention in which the amount of memory is increased by a factor N, where N is the number of ports, because of the duplication in memory that is required to accommodate the possibility that all the data from all of the ingress ports who go to a single egress port for each egress port. As stated in the present application, this additional memory increases the size of the integrated circuit chip and therefore the cost, thereof, as well as the addition of the yields from the manufacturing process.

In sharp contrast, the present invention utilizes a central cross-bar memory, which eliminates the need for the duplication in the memory. Accordingly, Applicants have combined

claims 12, 13 and 14 to recite that a single memory is utilized, which is clearly not shown or suggested by Kelly et al.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Instruments Incorporated

By _____

William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452